

be a Jewish chaplain, and he said to his Jewish chaplain friend, "Chaplain, do I offend you when I pray in the name of Jesus Christ?"

The Jewish chaplain said, "No, you do not. This is your faith and your tradition and you should pray in the name of your savior." This came from a Jewish chaplain.

Mr. Speaker, to me this is a very tragic situation. We are asking the President, as Commander-in-Chief, to use his constitutional authority to call up the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, and say, Mr. Secretary, I am Commander-in-Chief and I am asking that you protect the first amendment right of all of our chaplains, whether they be Muslim, Jewish or Christian.

As I begin to close, let me just read a letter that I received from an Army major who is a chaplain. This was last year.

"Dear Congressman Jones:

Thank you for your interest in ending the religious persecution that exists in our military today. I am a chaplain in the United States Army, and I can tell you in all honesty that religious persecution is taking place in the Army on a daily basis. The persecution centers on Christian chaplains praying in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ."

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear tonight that if we do not protect the right of our chaplains in the military; and I have spoken to many, almost 200 as I said just a few minutes ago, that are telling me that they are being encouraged not to pray outside of the church in the name of their religion and their faith; there is something wrong with that.

We are going to do a news conference tomorrow and ask the President to please protect the first amendment right of our Muslim, Jewish and our Christian chaplains, and I will tell you that the American Center for Law and Justice, ACLJ, they have over 158,000 signatures from people around this country asking the President to use his constitutional authority to protect the first amendment rights of all of our chaplains.

With that, I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, congratulations, you are a great man and a great patriot. And I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and God please bless and hold in his arms those who have given their life dying for this country, and I ask God to please bless America, and continue, God, to show us the light that we might save this great Nation and do what is right in your eyes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OPENING BORDERS TO U.S. BEEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to congratulate Mr. DINGELL. Mr. DINGELL lockers next to me in the House gym, and I see him occasionally, and I appreciate the fact that he gets down there on occasion, and we get a chance to talk.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Japanese border was opened to U.S. beef trade. This was good news. This border had been closed since December 2003. In 2003, we exported \$1.4 billion in beef to Japan. Since that time, the border has been closed, and we have lost over \$3 billion in trade. Regaining the market is not going to be easy. Australia has filled much of the void that was created by this ban on U.S. beef. We also must restore confidence in U.S. beef in Japan. I think roughly two-thirds of the Japanese public are saying that they are not sure that they want to eat beef from the United States. And of course, we have a very safe supply.

We also must ship beef from cows 20 months of age or younger, and to verify that age is going to be difficult because we do not have an animal ID program which is critical for this country. So we hope that this trade can be restored rather quickly.

Over the last year or two, much of the focus on trade issues, particularly in regard to agriculture, has been in regard to the Canadian border and also Japan. But as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, the major issue regarding agricultural trade is not Japan. It is not Canada. It is being played out to some degree this week in WTO talks in China. The major players in these talks in regard to agriculture are the United States and the European Union.

This brings me to a discussion of comparison of these two trading powers. On the chart here, we see the comparison. The economy of the United States is \$11.7 trillion a year. The European Union is \$9.4 trillion. So they are very comparable economies. Well, the largest two in the world. The import tariffs on European Union goods coming into the United States are roughly 12 percent. In contrast, our goods going into the European Union are being tariffed at 30 percent, more than double. This is hard to understand when you look at the comparison of the economies. The agriculture trade deficit of the United States right now is a minus \$6.3 billion to the European Union although we have a slight trade surplus with the overall trade worldwide. This has been a major problem for us. Of course, those tariff differences have been a major issue.

Export subsidies: These are subsidies that are given to promote exports. You see that the European Union is providing roughly \$3 billion in export subsidies; the United States, \$31 million in subsidies. So it is about a 100 to 1 ratio with the European Union providing

\$100 for every \$1 that we are providing in export subsidies.

Farm subsidy per acre: This is an interesting statistic. The United States subsidizes our farmers \$38 an acre, and the European Union subsidizes their agriculture \$295 an acre, almost six times as much as we do.

One other interesting statistic of comparison is that we have had two cases of BSE or mad cow disease in the United States, just two. In the European Union, they have had 189,000 cases of BSE in the last 15 years. Last year alone, in 2004, they had 756 cases of BSE where we have had two in the last 3 years in North America. So you would think that we would have a tremendous opportunity to trade beef with the European Union, and yet that has not happened. What has happened is the European Union has not allowed U.S. exports of beef into the European Union at all for the last several years because we use some hormones with our beef. They have used this as a tactic to keep our beef out even though the WTO has declared our beef perfectly safe. So we have had practically no trade with them in this regard.

We also have had genetically modified crops such as corn and soybeans which have been excluded, again for final sanitary reasons which, again, defy logic. They have also shut out our pork and our poultry.

Mr. Speaker, we do not think these issues will be resolved in this current round of trade talks that are occurring now in Hong Kong, but eventually, they must be addressed if there is going to be some equity in world trade. And if the WTO is going to move forward, we absolutely have to have some equanimity in the relations we have with the European Union, and we think that these trade issues need to be resolved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ALITO CORRECT ON CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I would also like to congratulate Mr. DINGELL for his 50 years of service to this institution and to his country.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to the attention of the American people that the President's nominee for United States Supreme Court, Judge Samuel Alito, wrote in a job application at the Justice Department some 20 years ago statements to the effect that the Constitution does not protect a right to an abortion. Judge Alito's statements regarding Roe v. Wade reflect a widely